

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was **not** written for publication and is **not** binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 20

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte DAIGO TAGUCHI

Appeal No. 2001-1073
Application No. 08/747,356

HEARD: August 14, 2002

Before KRASS, LALL, and SAADAT, Administrative Patent Judges.
LALL, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the Examiner's final rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 14-17 and 20.

According to Appellant (brief at pages 2 and 3), the present invention provides a visual user interface for describing or specifying shifts between screens. The visual user interface includes an edit image including node icons representative of the screens and data icons associated with and disposed within the node icons. In Figure 4 of Appellant's disclosure, the node icons are

designated by reference numerals 403, 404, etc., and data icons, which are associated with and disposed within a node icon such as 404, are designated by reference numeral 402. The present invention permits the user to describe or specify the links by drawing a link graphic, e.g., an arrow, between a data icon of one screen to a node icon of another screen. This is illustrated in Figure 4, where the top left data icon of the node icon 404 corresponding to SCENE_1 is linked to the node icon 403 corresponding to SCENE_2 with an arrow 405. As a result, the hyperlink structure can be viewed at a glance and the scenario-editing person can understand the structure of the scenario visually and intuitively, thereby improving the working efficiency of the editing work.

The following claim further illustrates the invention.

1. A scenario edit device for editing a scenario describing links between presentation screens, comprising:

a scenario storage means for storing the scenario;

a node icon creating means for creating a node icon representative of a presentation screen described in the scenario and a data icon associated with and disposed within the node icon;

a link graphic creating means for creating a link graphic connecting a data icon associated with a node icon of one presentation screen to a node icon of another presentation screen to designate a link from said one presentation screen to said another presentation screen;

Appeal No. 2001-1073
Application No. 08/747,356

an edit image creating means for creating an edit image with the node icons, the data icon, and the link graphic;

an edit-time display manner storage means for storing an edit-time display manner including information on at least the display position of the node icon within the edit image;

an image display means for displaying the edit image created by said edit image creating means;

an input control means for controlling an input signal that was entered from a given input device using the edit image displayed on said image display means and preserving information about the input signal; and

a screen shift changing means for detecting an edit operation for a screen shift processing from the information preserved in said input control means, and updating the scenario stored in said scenario storage means according to the edit operation.

The Examiner relies on the following references:

Peterson et al. (Peterson)	5,652,714	July 29, 1997 (filed Sep. 30, 1994)
Hansen et al. (Hansen)	5,675,753	Oct. 7, 1997 (filed Apr. 24, 1995)
Kogan et al. (Kogan)	5,809,317	Sep. 15, 1998 (effectively filed Dec. 30, 1992)

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 14-17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Hansen and Kogan.

Appeal No. 2001-1073
Application No. 08/747,356

Rather than repeat the arguments of Appellant and the Examiner, we make reference to the brief (paper no. 13) and the Examiner's answer (paper no. 14) for the respective details thereof.

OPINION

We have considered the rejections advanced by the Examiner and the supporting arguments. We have, likewise, reviewed the Appellant's arguments set forth in the brief.

We reverse.

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness (see In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992)), which is established when the teachings of the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to one of ordinary skill in the art (see In re Bell, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 USPQ2d, 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)).

In forming a prima facie case in accordance with the above guidelines, the Examiner at page 4 of the answer admits that Peterson does not explicitly teach the claimed edit-time display

manner storage means, however asserts (answer at page 5) that "[i]t would have been obvious . . . to have incorporated Kogan's edit-time storage means into the Peterson's multimedia editing system,"

Furthermore, the Examiner recognizes that Peterson does not teach the limitation of connecting a data icon associated with a node icon of one presentation screen to a node icon of another presentation screen, however asserts (answer at page 5) that "[i]t would have been obvious . . . to displayed (sic, display) the links between the data icon and the node icon, since Hansen explicitly suggested the feature."

Appellant argues (brief at page 4) that "[n]owhere does Hansen teach or suggest that the screen icons, boxes 410, 412, 414, have disposed therein, icons representing screen objects (data icons)."

Appellant further argues (id.) that "[f]irst, Hansen teaches a fundamentally different way of editing screen shifts than Peterson. In Peterson, a screen display is used in designating links between presentation screens. By contrast, Hansen employs a dialog box shown in Fig. 6, for designating link between presentations screens. Second, . . . [t]o avoid cluttering the

display, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified Peterson to include data icons within node icons and arrows that connect the data icons to node icons."

Furthermore, Appellant argues (brief at page 5) that "[t]he Examiner has established no motivation . . . to further modify such a combined system of Peterson and Kogan to store an edit-time display manner including information on the display position of the node icon within the edit image, as claimed."

We agree with Appellant's analysis of the combination of Peterson, Hansen and Kogan. Even if these references were properly combinable, Peterson only shows node icons 242a, 242b, 242c in Figures 10 and 11 which represent screens but does not show any data icons disposed within the node icons. We are not convinced that Hansen via Figure 6 and the associate text suggests that data icons would be disposed within the node icons of Peterson. Instead, Hansen uses a dialog box to create the link between the various node icons or various screens such as 412, 410 and 414 in Figure 4 of Hansen. Whereas Kogan may suggest the editing feature as suggested by the Examiner, it does not disclose the creation of data icons and the links connecting the various data icons in the various node icons as recited in claim 1 or independent claim 6 or independent claim 14.

Appeal No. 2001-1073
Application No. 08/747,356

Additionally, regarding independent claim 6, it further recites the feature of a scroll control means for instructing said edit image creating means to create an edit image with a scroll bar attached thereto (see item f of claim 6). Therefore, we are not convinced that the Examiner has established a prima facie case of obviousness within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Accordingly, we reverse the rejection of independent claims 1, 6 and 14 and the dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17 and 20 over Peterson, Hansen and Kogan.

Appeal No. 2001-1073
Application No. 08/747,356

REVERSED

ERROL A. KRASS)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	
)	BOARD OF PATENT
PARSHOTAM S. LALL)	APPEALS
Administrative Patent Judge)	AND
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
)	
)	
MAHSHID D. SAADAT)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

PSL/jrg

Appeal No. 2001-1073
Application No. 08/747,356

FOLEY AND LARDNER
WASHINGTON HARBOUR
SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW
PO BOX 25696
WASHINGTON, DC 20007-8696

